

## **PAWG Agenda**

9:00 AM – Thursday October 25, 2012  
Rendezvous Conference Room, BLM Pinedale Field Office

Note: Agenda times are tentative and may be adjusted

### **9:00 to 9:05      Call to Order - Shane DeForest**

PAWG members present: Aimee Davison, Bart Myers, Dave Vlcek, John Anderson, Paul Hagenstein, Joy Bannon, Stephanie Kessler, Arthur Reese, Shane DeForest,, Eugene Ninnie. Michael Kramer

Paul: moves to accept agenda as presented.

### **9:05 to 9:20      Overview Agenda, Confirmation of Quorum, Review and approval of August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Meeting Minutes – DeForest**

Joy suggests we work through lunch, however John has a commitment.

Meeting Minutes: Tony Gosar comments that he didn't see the minutes in the library. Shelley Gregory assures the group that they were delivered to the library.

**Motion to accept the August 7, 2012 minutes. Art moves, Mike Seconds. Minutes Approved with no changes.**

### **9:20 to 9:50      BLM report on Recreational activities completed under the anticline mitigation funding (Informational Item) – Katryana Keely**

Powerpoint: New Fork/East Fork boat access improvement project is 4.5 miles south/southwest of Boulder on the Boulder South Road, about 200 Yards downstream from the confluence of the East Fork and New Fork rivers. This is a popular access point for outfitters as well as recreationists. Lots of people put in at Boulder Bridge and float down to this access. Place was pretty much trashed before the improvements. The presentation includes what has been done and what will be completed. Started in 2011 and will be finished in 2013. (presentation is on PAWG website). Access road is about ¼ mile. Questions: Mike Kramer – boating access to the gas wells – now impossible – 4 foot drop. Kat: Game and Fish is putting in a site hear that area which will be (sec. 16) a better alternative for now. It is off of Paradise Road. Will signs be made of heavy gauge steel so when people shoot them? Vlcek: with the increase in use of the New Fork, have there been any discussions about installing log jams to increase habitat for fish? Log jams have been successful in other areas. Kat is not familiar with any potential discussion on this. Shane: this is worth considering. Warren Bridge and the Upper Green areas have seen success with these. Lower Middle New Fork River is sterile. Trout Unlimited could help with this.

### **9:50 to 10:00      Break – pass on break**

**10:00 to 10:45     Review and discussion of cultural task group's recommendations and status of implementation (Informational Item) - Sam Drucker/ DeForest**

Sam: Powerpoint: Sam has been liaison with PAWG since its inception. There have been some new beginnings since 2010 – a few accomplishments to mention since then. Joint partnership with local Wyoming Archaeological Chapter and BLM to do recordation on the Holden Hill (historical inscription site). Over 900 inscriptions recorded to date. Still in process of starting the write up. Brought in people from NOC (Denver office) specialists in 3D photography. This was done with every group of inscriptions that they could find. Sublette County Historical Society brought in Wyoming Conservation Corp. to do work at New Fork park property – part of Lander Trail mitigation project. Kids did a lot of work – fences, bridges, gates, etc.. They did a great job.

Last cultural task group meeting: Site monitoring projects. (1) Site monitoring program created thanks to Rob Schweitzer of BLM. Holden Hill, Wardell, Calpet, Trappers, Lander Road, Meridian Site, New Fork House Pit, Mesa Stone Circle, Sommers Ranch Rock, Aspen Ridge and Blue Rim Paleontology, Ross Butte, Stewart Point, Green River Drift Trail and Boulder Lake Archaeological Area. (2) Consider Lander Trail View shed and the alternates routes discovered. The original view shed monitoring program set up with SHPO has lost its funding. We are in the process of trying to do the photographic work ourselves. Finally finished original Lander Trail PA mitigations by installing the Kiosks on highway 191. Copies of these are on the wall in the hall of the BLM building. Big hit with the public. Good interpretation comments. Also done - discovery of Wagner Variant of the Lander Road. Looked at original field notes of the engineer and digitized the alignment, then searched on the ground – finding the track. Added 3.5-4 miles across the heart of the anticline (we have ¼ mile buffer). This led to an amended programmatic agreement for the Lander Road. Trying to protect original road as well as Wagner Variant now, too. Key point: We are doing our best to accomplish saving the trail and saving its view shed. Had to put in a few pads in the view shed for mitigation. Jeremy White's publication on the Lander Road, and using an ArcMap - Cogo Program – we were able to map the Wagner Variant. Sam is an old surveyor so he could decipher the historic survey information. [Good job Sam!] Kiosk location allows viewing of the actual Lander Trail (both east and west).

Archeological Site Predictive modeling: consultants have begun studies of footprints, locations, comparisons of house pits, ceramics, and fire pits across Wyoming and are focusing on the Pinedale area. Doing best to make sure that this scientific information can be shared. All voluntary work. Consultant will write up report and present to Wyoming Archeological Society. Vlcek: house pits frequently 6000 years old. Represent some of the earliest structures for the entire Rocky Mountain Region. Eugene asks where the people came from. Sam: these people could have come from Bering Sea, across the Atlantic, or ?. They call them the 'Archaic people'. New science coming out on this migration. It predated tribes, so perhaps just groups of people – probably mostly family members (nomads). Some of the house sites are believed to have been seasonally used for 3000 years. We don't really know yet how they were used. The footprint of the house sites are being compared to determine if the same types of people are using the same area. Most entrances are on the east.

10:45 to 11:15      Green River Drift (Informational Item) – Sam Drucker

Sam: Old task group and points they wanted to cover in previous presentation. Task group accomplished an awful lot. Group brought points to BLM, and most were accomplished. Proud of the group. Clint Gilchrist was chair of that group.

Green River Drift: SHPO defines a trail as a historic property, fluid and dynamic. Management of the trail needs to be figured out. 115 year history – it has changed throughout the years, which is good for it to remain a historical entity. (property). Less susceptible to effects than most because of this continuing change. Nominated to National Register of Historic Places by SHPO. Still working through and trying to reach a final product. Lots of issues surrounding the Drift and how it relates to the surrounding area. Hopefully sooner than later we will be able to reach a conclusion.

11:15 – 11:30      **Public Comment and Discussion:** Recreation, Cultural, and Green River Drift

Paul: Other stock driveways exist. Sam: several more in Sublette County, these may or may not be nominated, we'll see how the GR Drift nomination goes. Art: if nomination is successful – how does this (106 compliance) affect development on the Pinedale Anticline? Sam: Increase some work done by BLM. Hoping for a management tool to use on the drift which would facilitate easier methodology to look at the drift and how it could complicate multiple uses of the area. (a programmatic agreement). Vlcek: Photo in the presentation is from Jonita Sommers. Where is the sagebrush?! Vlcek looked at the nomination. He commends SHPO as they looked at all of the other large drifts and stock management areas throughout the state.

Art: what is the timeline on the process for the nomination? Sam: Don't have any idea. It's out of local hands. Washington D.C. BLM office is looking at different aspects and the effects. Already accepted by the advisory council. Art: Aspects that Sam can't tell about – what precludes this? Shane: WO level questions – how the National Preservation Act interacts with requirements of some of the other acts – ESA, etc.. No confusion about eligibility, just how management of the site will fit in with and complement the other federal authorities we have to manage concurrently. BLM still trying to figure out what some of these finer details are. We cannot discuss actual management until these things resolved.

10:15 (we are ahead of schedule!):

Vlcek's concern related to cultural taskforce: We hear about all of the good stuff being done in the anticline, but not always the problems. Development of the 7-28 well pad (QEP) on the anticline was in the vicinity of one of most sensitive Native American sites. This has been known for over 25 years. Well pad complicated for several reasons. Vlcek involved when he was a BLM employee. Vlcek states that slanderous and other misinformation given out by BLM Management. Project permitted illegally, according to Vlcek. Lot of filtering during discussion of this project. Letters from landowners, etc., are public knowledge and critical to the process. Mistruths spoken by management to Wyoming State Office people. Letters from tribes and adjacent landowners (Sandovals). Brought this up because it represents one bad project, and a growing lack of attention to normal processes he sees occurring in this office (cultural). Affected

interests are affected interests. Sandovals very concerned about this (7-28) project. Has wanted to protect this site for decades. Sam Drucker was involved with all of this work. One day Vlcek came to the office and found out that the project and files had all be assigned to someone else. Generated a lack of trust. BLM Staff in PFO no longer communicating in a professional manner. This bothers Vlcek. He built the PFO program some 30 years ago and is no longer involved, but he hates to see degradation of the program and lack of interest from publics. Last Saturday, Alliance for Historic Preservation directed questions to Shane and have not heard anything back. Vlcek would like to see these communications/processes improved upon.

Mike Kramer: what is the site (7-28)? Vlcek: it is a burial site. 25 years ago, Vlcek brought the tribes into the picture. Harley Mocroft (Sylvia Sandoval's Dad) knew about it (Mr. Mocroft was adjacent landowner, land still in the family). Late 90's when they were doing seismic – development of the anticline. At that time, some of the sites were recorded. Shoshone and Arapaho involved. Bio-archaeological evaluation of the area. Rick Weatherman located two sites. Had lots of documentation on the area. Appropriate process ignored and the project approved. John: what damage did the well site do to the site? Vlcek: It's in the view shed. Location provides physical access that was unavailable prior to that. All of the effort done to try and close the access was thrown out of the window. Issue is damage done to the relationships with PFO and SHPO, etc.. He would like to see this rectified. John: Is this similar to the Green River Drift issue – multiple use complications? Shane: No. Vlcek: message sent out by the BLM on 7-28 was not a good message because the staff member who inappropriate provided the clearance, was given an award, which sends a totally wrong message. When a person breaks the rules, they should be held responsible. People view this as a slap in the face – the wrong way to go. Things are being done illegally. Joy: why, Dave, are you bringing this to the PAWG's attention? Vlcek: Because the issue hasn't gone away. Vlcek firmly believes in transparency and disclosure. Also – wants to get it off his chest – the PFO cultural program is in jeopardy. Things are not always rosy. Important that the PAWG be aware of this. Oct. 2012 letter – Advisory Council – they are well aware of this. We'll see what happens in the future. No further questions.

Shane: wanted a few minutes to rebut Dave Vlcek's comments in regard to the 7-28 project:

Point 1: Agency reaction: there are some incorrect assumptions. Shane not sure what info was provided. Letters referenced, Shane didn't get them. If Dave has SHPO (April and Oct) letters – you will read fairly stern accusations from SHPO. August letter referenced purposeful malicious manipulation of the rules. Etc.

SHPO's letter stated "it's our opinion.....BLM intentionally misused.....termination consultation...no further consideration..."

Letter went to advisory council. Governing body rendered opinion – missteps made of the 106 process. Confusion resulted. Possible incomplete understanding of the process. ACHP is the law of the land, never found a violation of law, nor malicious willful intention to do anything. What isn't mentioned, there are some areas in State protocol which don't specifically address the process which was undertaken. Didn't say could or couldn't do it – just flow of process. No violation of law.

Point 2: comment related to interested parties and relationship to consultation. Tribes made recommendations to BLM with respect to interested parties. They said stop. BLM did. No longer include them as interested parties.

Point 3: Access issue. Road that goes past the site was there before 1950 and is still there today. Has been open to public continuously. Development of pad is off of spur from that road. No improved access created or to the site. Access predated knowledge of the site's existence.

Vlcek: Tribe continues to be concerned. Greater issue to emphasize – was that in the Aug 6, 2012 advisory council letter from Washington? “we understand PFO..... SHPO only in writing.....” That was key to the overriding problem – staff on the project, program here – they no longer want to talk with people.

Shane: problem is that Dave Vlcek is out of the cycle. Several conversations verbally, arrived at an endpoint with agreement, consensus, etc. Example: Acknowledged by SHPO that the original determination of eligibility was inaccurately arrived at. Regulations not followed. Process should be done over. Found email exchange that documented that for the record. Problem was we said that best way to communicate is in writing so that there is a record and everyone can see what was discussed. Never agency position to no longer talk with them. Needed written record.

Vlcek: Stands by SHPO and advisory council documentation. Felt sorry for adjacent landowners who expressed interest in the process (before Shane's time), and they were blown off.

#### **DFO Report: (agenda adjustment):**

See handout. Will mention a few: Shane: Mesa Mule Deer project 2010 matrix trigger. Public scoping meeting date: November 1<sup>st</sup> (Ryegrass). Field Tour and evening open house public meeting initiating scoping process. All invited. Complementary mule deer project ongoing – Wyoming Mule Deer Project. Mesa Water Project completed. Construction should begin quickly. Mesa Fence Modification project. 30-40 miles priority for fencing. Construction should be underway. John: why is this work so expensive? Shane: Not sure, but labor intensive project. John: what is the access? Shane: access pretty good, just very labor intensive. It's over \$1000 a mile. Fontenelle Fire was big deal in local area. 60-70 miles of fence burned. FS and BLM boundary fence and historical issues. Still issues determining ownership of lands and fences. Solution seems to have been found. Vlcek: historical fence – Bill Lanning had wanted to get rid of it years ago. What does the BLM intend to do with the cultural sites? Speaker tonight about post fire investigations. Shane: no cultural site investigations planned at this time. Funding involves stabilization and rehab of programs. Looked at necessary ways to stabilize soils and rebuild infrastructure. Sheer amount of all of this was about 600 million. Limited funding for cultural program. Stephanie: is new fence wildlife friendly? Shane: Yes. Electrification of anticline: construction ongoing. Denbury's project – pipeline – about 200 miles. Process in early stages. Plan of Development in process. Rock Springs is lead office for this project. Pinedale, Lander, Rawlins, and one other office involved. PXP – TPL agreeing to purchase lease. BLM helping as they can. Reclamation: downturn in production has allowed BLM more time to do this work. Feedback being provided to operators. Dry year, reflecting on reclamation efforts done in 2012. Experimenting with successes. Staffing updates mentioned. John Huston, AFM, leaving. Will fill in behind hopefully by end of year. PAPO data management position should be filled soon. PADMS System still getting bugs out. This system

represents the main, significant, and only method to keep track of reclamation and monitoring (electronically). Shane Wassmuth returning to PFO.

Questions/comments: Stephanie: Dates: Wildlife Planning Meeting will be (was cancelled 10/24) in February when we will have better information, and that is why the meeting was postponed. PAPO project proposals deadline is 10/31/12. PAPO board meeting is where the review of the project proposals, budget, plans, etc., will be done. Funding down so there will be lots of discussion for available dollars. Meeting is in Cheyenne on 12/6.

Stephanie: wildlife planning meeting's delay – does it affect the monitoring efforts? Shane: no. The issue is just to get reports formatted and finalized prior to the meeting. QA/QC issues for consistency.

1:30 – 1:45      **Public Comment and Discussion:** RAC & possibility of PAWG being transformed into a sub-part of the RAC.

Handout. RAC meeting today also. Current agenda already full. Four nominations for the 7 vacant PAWG spots not going to work. Actually only 3 nominations. Stephanie: Aren't all positions expiring this year? Shane: no. FACA chartering/operational issues. If we don't have a quorum, no decisions could be made. Other informational avenues (meetings, etc.) available. PAWG informational sharing not effective. Question if we are left with information function only, how can we create contribution over and above what's already being done?

RAC – dealing with regional/statewide issues. They provide information directly to the State Director. RAC has openings – they are soliciting nominations. Would be great opportunity for PAWG members. Opportunity open until November 20<sup>th</sup>. Encourage individuals who are interested in continuing. Stephanie: Categories in RAC – are they the same as the PAWG's? Shelley: Cat 1 is Ag producers, timber, commercial, etc., Cat 2 – State and Regional environmental, archy, disp. rec, wild horses, Cat 3 – gov't local, tribal, academic. This is similar to the PAWG (except tribal).

Main PAWG's concern in merging with the RAC – preservation of local issues and concerns. 4 openings on the RAC – these concerns could be met. PAWG's concerns – things going okay today, but future changes? If we walk away from the PAWG, we could not provide that communication. The RAC has a point of contact for this type of thing. They advise on local issues as well as Statewide. If a member of the public raises an issue to a RAC member, the RAC can form a subcommittee to deal with it. RAC meetings are not solely to provide advice to state director – all of Wyoming. Our District manager attends the RAC meetings. Local managers give info to District. Vlcek: District Manager going to Washington D.C.? Shane: He will be senior advisor to assistant director BLM Ops. Job is advertised. Shane put together options for PAWG to consider.

Options/Discussion: Any recommendations will be submitted.

Joy: Point made about future changes – how long for a FACA approval of a new PAWG group?

Shane: wasn't suggesting that a group be re-made for Pinedale Anticline. RAC's subcommittee would be the avenue for that. Joy: Was Shane able to talk with Don about PAWG becoming

subcommittee/ Shane: yes, there is some redundancy. Challenge with standing up the PAWG as a subcommittee if there isn't a request for particular information. If operators come in proposing to adjust operations kicking off a new issue. If BLM wants to consult with the public on something like this, how can public's input be provided back to the BLM? FACA functions – we have to be cautious about receiving recommendations if in a different format from public scoping. We could also hold a public workshop. It depends on how it's designed. Key is timeliness of getting information out there. Both PAWG and RAC meet quarterly. Joy: DFO is provided to the RAC? Shane: yes – the District Manager provides this information. Joy: Is the report the same as what they just got? Shane: Similar. It is consistent. Shane might give DM 4 pages, and s/he may edit.

Joy: if PAWG wanted to remain, with lower # of members, is there an option to change the #? Shelley: No. Law says it has to be 10 or 15. Shane: whatever the PAWG wants to do, it has to do it today. Stephanie: Is there an option to open a call for nominations to get more? Shane: Option is there. Needed to flesh out where PAWG is going prior to that. Secretary of the Interior appoints members, so it does take a lot of time.

John: what do others think? He is leaning towards RAC taking on PAWG's role. Primary reason is that it is evident that there is not a lot of interest. Things could change quickly, but for the members who drove a long distance, there really isn't a lot of substance to today's meeting.

Art: RAC – has attended these meetings, and there is a lot of redundancy. It allows recommendations to be made to a higher level than Field Office Manager (Shane's position). Issues may not be swept under the carpet. Wyoming hasn't had RAC since Jim Geringer was Governor. Thinks good opportunity.

Stephanie: Implied that PAWG members would have good opportunity to be nominated to RAC.

Shane: No guarantees. Heard strong encouragement for PAWG members to (from John Ruhs) to put in for.

Vlcek: Here in Sublette County, issues are in limbo, and have been for some time, and until these issues (EIS', etc.), it's hard to sink teeth into things. Seems like they are stuck in bureaucracy.

Shane: PAWG doesn't have purview over these projects, but RAC would have.

Eugene: How would the RAC be able to retain local representation?

Shane: Could submit nomination.

Eugene: This could be lopsided.

Shane: True, but local people (here) should put in nominations.

Shelley: RAC considers localities when looking for members for representation throughout the State.

Eugene: They do look at parts of the state.

Stephanie: is there someone local?

Shelley: None at this time (Kemmerer is closest).

Vlcek: Is the nomination process the same?

Shelley: Yes.

Shane: If a local person didn't get on the RAC, then the conduit remains. If someone from the public comes forth with an issue, then the PFO can elevate that.

Shelley: The RAC meets though out the state. Public invited. There has already been a meeting in Pinedale and there is a meeting in Rock Springs in January. They move the meetings around to gather input.

John: How long do meetings last?

Shelley: two days.

John: Because of travel time, this could be problematic

Shelley: They have a coordinator and a designated federal officer, and you can send info to them.

Joy: Conference call is also an option.

Shane: This is third option for PAWG. The RAC's process is similar to the PAWG. Feed the information to the appropriate representative on the RAC.

John: any other perspectives?

Aimee: thinks that the meetings have been informational. BLM issues and recommendations from that. Hasn't been a lot of that for quite a while. Thinks that RAC is appropriate venue for issues. Recommendations pushed back to the BLM. Local issues can come to light for that. In favor for RAC recommendation.

Joy: Found appealing – likes workshop idea (local issues), and likes RAC idea too. If the RAC issue - should we incorporate something to ensure Pinedale issues?

John: We could request the BLM continue to provide informational workshops on a regular basis.

Shane: Eugene recommended that someone (originally when he started) explain the ROD – so a public meeting was done for that. Information passed back and forth as needed/requested.

Thinks Joy is correct for some assurance for information sharing.

John: Easy to stick short statement speaking to that point.

Stephanie: Rather see recommendation limited to very narrow nature – whatever the decision on the last three sentences (of Shane's proposal – handout). Doesn't agree with characterization in some parts. When task force disbanded before, we lost a lot of opportunities. She could not support some the statements prior to the last 3 sentences. Would consider the action items. Doesn't think we have provided actual meaningful public meetings.

Vlcek: Agrees with Stephanie on issues when the task group disbanded.

Shane: Acknowledges that sentiment – what led up to the disbandment. FACA – laws were being violated and info not being funneled through the PAWG. Was no other mechanism. Don't forget that part. But, the public felt like they were able to do something.

John: Background provided in the handout. All we need now is the action.

Stephanie: not sure whether in favor of the action. I come from Lander, but focus on Sublette County. Concerned about whether local people are concerned about losing some focus on local issues.

John: One of the big problems, is that we don't have enough (quorum) people to take action.

Stephanie: One option is to ask for another open nomination period and see if we get enough people to work through August 2014 Charter life. Doesn't know if this will make a difference.

Mike: The annual planning meetings – aren't they enough?

Shane: We aren't going to provide the same information twice. Meeting specific agendas – there could be another topic in addition to the usual ones. These meetings are publicized as good as the PAWG ones. These meetings may or may not be well attended – depending on the topic.



Joy: If we go in this different direction (RAC), could Shane or Shelley email information on when meetings will happen, etc. Current emails are great! BLM website fine, but email is much better. The DFO report good also.

Shelley: Yes – no problem. Already have an interested parties list, would add those interested to it. All meetings also posted on twitter and facebook (BLM sites).

Paul: Task force went down the tubes when the high priced gentlemen talked to the group. Thinks that people in this group have learned a lot. Sometimes information is not worth listening to.

John: Information has been valuable piece of the PAWG.

Eugene: Why did the RAC come about?

Shelley: Every State has a RAC. Wyoming had one, it expired. Requirement for establishment (1995) by Dept. of Interior.

Art: RAC given up because parties could not agree on who would have more clout, and how it would work. Gov. Geringer and BLM State Office personnel.

Vlcek: In his 30 years time with the BLM, saw many different boards, generally local; these were learning experiences.

Stephanie: was on an air quality one in the 1990's.

Vlcek: RAC is statewide rather than regional. His interests are locally focused.

Eugene: Conduit – information conveyed to Shane, then Shane conveys it on up.

John: Any public input?

Courtney Skinner: No matter what, he has seen room jam-packed during information items of controversial nature. The group has lost interest and this is a quieter time, but interest could start again. He has been advocate of local control. Statewide meetings are more difficult to attend because of the time requirements. Local focus easier to deal with issues. In all of his time attending, sometimes he thinks the PAWG information goes into a black hole, but people always go away with information. That information has helped Courtney in his work. Thinks PAWG valuable local board, even with struggle to fill seats. The input still valuable. Fears that when it goes to the State, local and regional input is lost to a point. PAWG should be commended for the job they've done. If we get the NPL or others, then the audiences will come back. Feels PAWG has solved some of the problems with some of the committees – PAWG still processing and disseminating information. Consensus is part of secret of success. Thinks too valuable a resource and opportunity in this community for public members to share information.

Dawn Ballou: if you are wondering why public information isn't here, people who have knowledge and resources on the ground, it waters down what could be valuable information. Personally would not like it to merge with the RAC. Value with keeping it local. Committees valuable. Meetings are difficult to attend for people who have jobs.

Paul: Thanks to the BLM for the information tours.

Stephanie: wants to know current PAWG members – terms not limited – what do they think?

Art, Dave and Aimee would continue. Eugene and John have both re-applied.

Vlcek: his opinion – he will find a way to find a voice and a place at the table. He joined the PAWG because he had been affiliated for many years. Had seen disastrous meetings with BLM. Likes current format. Would like to continue with the PAWG. Thinking about the RAC. Has learned a little bit after 30 plus years of being involved in resource management. Agrees that when task groups dismantled, it was torpedo. Maruska was a clown! Maybe the purpose was to torpedo it.

John: feels that Vlcek conspiring to a conspiracy issue that just wasn't there. John likes being on the PAWG – enjoys learning and going on the field trips. He seriously doubts about value of continuing the PAWG. Doubtful of PAWG's future.

Art: question of effectiveness of group. What does the PAWG do in terms of recommendations to Shane – are they affected by Shane, and is a PAWG actually a function entity like it should be? He doesn't see it.

Aimee: Truly thinks that there are a lot of public engagement opportunities. These opportunities advertised.

Stephanie: Agrees. Probably why public abandoned PAWG process. Not a good bang for your buck.

Paul: how do you make something happen when your hands are tied? Lot of things we'd like to do, but cannot because of the regulations.

Bart: If not enough members for a quorum, and informational only, how does this differ from the other meetings?

Shane: would provide info to only 5 people. In several years, there were only 3 actionable items to vote on.

Stephanie: For the record, she doesn't agree with remedy and BLM could have been to give them clear information about what the boundaries were. That was some of the fertile ground where local information and recommendation given. Doesn't see that that was the only response that could have been made. Task forces devoted a lot of time and local expertise and meant well, and weren't themselves given or understood the parameters.

John: Sure that Stephanie is correct, but not an option going forward. His impression about how the groups worked – they were engaged and worked hard but didn't always understand what was possible.

Mike: Whatever happened to the water brochure?

Shane: Drafted, but not mass printed. Added later - the water brochure was in final review, and it was decided to hold printing of the brochure the second report from the Water monitoring study on the PAPA comes out. This is the Low Level Petroleum Hydrocarbon report. It was thought there might be some updated information which should be added to the brochure. This is hoped for in the first quarter of 2013.

Vlcek: looking through minutes of the last meeting. How do you formally get a recommendation to Shane? Took reclamation tour – recalls asking how to make recommendations.

Shane: Asked for advice, PAWG had conversation about forming subcommittee. He remembers that the information needed to be determined if it's technical or not. A subcommittee was formed, but they couldn't meet.

Vlcek: Minutes are good. Recreation stuff – talked about last meeting. Got presentation today; he has some thoughts about reclamation on the anticline. How does he bring this forward – to get PAWG recommendation?

Shane: Information flow – cleanest way is Shane comes to PAWG and asks about a particular issue. Dirtier way is brochures – PAWG reviews and recommends. Info should go both ways. Bring info from public interactions, BLM asks for advice. What we don't want – Advice pertinent to the advisory nature of the PAWG. Any citizen can come in the door and schedule some time with a staff member. That staff member can take the information on up. Difference in this group – parity of access - ?

John: Should take lunch and think this over and come back and discuss. One option is to do nothing. He isn't suggesting that, but could be considered.

Shane: that would be a byproduct of no consensus.

Stephanie: Lunch isn't enough time to think about this.

John: It's time that we deal with this.

Shane: We can then agree to do nothing, or adopt one of the options.

Adjourn for lunch until 1:00 PM.

Meeting reconvenes.

John: would entertain a motion.

**Bart: Motions to let PAWG charter expire in August 2014 and discontinue meetings.**

John – clarify – no more meetings as of now?

John: Nice thing about PAWG is that they can come to consensus.

Discussion:

Art: not sure that three options in Shane's handout were all considered. Could end up with 2 motions: discontinue the PAWG on schedule in 2014, and second motion is to become part of the RAC.

Eugene: "simultaneously request a subcommittee be formed by the RAC to be available for local consultation (ensure continued local connection)".

With all due respect to Shane's different scenarios where local people are, there is a lot to be lost. We need to close the gap.

John: For clarity's sake: if the subcommittee goes to the RAC, would not be governed by FACA.

John: RAC narrowly defines issues.

Shelley: if there is an issue in the Pinedale Anticline, it would have to be recommendation to be addressed.

Eugene: Could be something like the Pavillion issue, then the subcommittee would be dissolved once the answer provided.

Paul: if we discontinue the PAWG and to go the RAC, we may have a rude awakening. Paul applied a long time ago for the RAC, and was never thanked, etc.

Eugene: people are alienated.

Bart: boils down to if there isn't enough interest for enough members for a quorum, then nothing is being accomplished. Meetings are information only, and that information is provided in other forums. Not enough members to take action.

Mike: Feels that this has been informational (PAWG meetings). Planning meetings provide the same information and input, especially water, air, wildlife.

Vlcek: People around town are concerned about loss of habitat.

Paul: some PAWG members are interested in all of the above.

Mike: if we had more public interest and input, then PAWG should continue. He suggests people bring complaints to the PAWG meetings, but they do not come.

Paul: they are afraid to be crucified.

John: too bad that more people didn't apply. Discouraging. If we knew that we had a full contingent, it would be more interesting.

Stephanie: they've tried to dig up folks for interest.

John: Stephanie and Joy did this. Environmental community's efforts speak volumes. Perhaps PAWG not all that important at this time.

Eugene: RAC – state run agency.

Stephanie: Her only concern – checked the agenda and didn't see where there was advertised a vote to disband the PAWG. She is concerned if the public should have been given more specific notice.

John: Vlcek speaks against the motion. What would it look like to open up the nominations again?

Shane: Recommendation would be carried forward. Decision ultimately resides with the Secretary based on recommendation from the State Director.

John: Could try, might not happen, but if approved, possibly up to a year.

Shelley: Wouldn't have a quorum during this time. Group could decide not to meet during this time.

Vlcek: If PAWG disbanded, does this require an amendment to supplemental EIS.

Shane: No. Page 19 Section 2.12. Adaptive management. Annually decide if PAWG should continue.

John: PAWG recommends, but ultimately Shane's decision.

Vlcek: further quotes ROD.

John: no further discussion. Should have vote.

**Vote on Motion to** *Let the PAWG charter expire in Aug 2014 and discontinue meetings after this Oct meeting. Simultaneously request a subcommittee be formed by the RAC to be available for local consultation (ensure continued local connection). Field Manager continue to be receptive and provide opportunities for meaningful public input and workshops as needed on matters of local concern.*

**Seven in favor, three opposed (Paul H., Stephanie K., and Dave V.)**

Further discussion:

BLM could reopen nominations to allow the public one last chance to signal their desire to retain the PAWG. Add *Reopen nominations and see if a reasonable number of nominations were received. If enough nominations weren't received, then continue with remainder of recommendation to stop meeting and allow charter to expire.*

Shelley: there were three nomination periods in past year. Minimum number of nominations received for first two nomination periods; less than minimum for third. Not enough interest. Local constituency has been mined.

Stephanie: aside from the cost of putting this in the federal register, what is the cost of seeing if there is interest. Doesn't think that the public was made aware. Should we sustain the option?

Vlcek: agrees. He would have preferred to talk with folks also.

John: No, we aren't acting like that was the last step. Door not closed. Shane's wording to reopen nominations may solve these concerns.

Vlcek: Open positions are Mike, Joy, Bart, Stephanie, 2 category 2s, 2 category 1's one category 3 open positions.

John: What would that look like – when would you say there was enough public input suggesting we keep the PAWG?

Shane: Shelley's comment – what we've been doing. Not meant to be disrespectful. Struggling to determine if there was reasonable interest to continue the PAWG. If purpose is to seek a diverse set of perspectives from individuals to provide information, then we should seek more than one application for each position. Expertise mix is important to complement one another.

John: if 7 people contacted Shane saying they were interested in applying – would that be enough?

Shane: would ask the PAWG what the goal is – enough warm bodies to continue, or enough expertise to serve the purpose of the PAWG's charter? Not a lot for Shane to bring forward to the group at this time. What good is it to receive information if public doesn't want to receive it, if the community demographic doesn't provide input, what good is that?

Vlcek: lots of folks talk with him about a lot of issues. It takes a bit to figure out how the PAWG works. Has heard lately, the rigs are down, breathing period. If prices go up, then people will be panicked again. He knows the quietness is because the rigs are down, economy down. It was crazy 10 years ago.

Aimee: No conclusion that the public couldn't voice their opinions during the other public meetings. Thinks that we are not seeing anything come down from Shane's level to look at, which is the purpose of the group. If there is something specific, then the PAWG group is supposed to advise the BLM on. We are not seeing this.

Vlcek: Agrees, but thinks that the PAWG should be bringing issues to Shane, not the other way around. BLM here to listen. Not dictate.

John: 3 ways – give Shane advice when he asks for it, when he doesn't ask for it – info only, give advice and expect him to follow it (actually can't do the third one, unreasonable).

Vlcek: Clear that PAWG group gives simple recommendation(s).

Art: where are we? There was a motion and vote.

Shane: is there a specific reference – super, simple, majority to move forward with recommendation.

Shelley: take the form of a memo – need majority vote only.

Art: motion made and voted on. Advice is done to Shane.

John: Shane was trying to use a little different process to ground truth the vote. Why voted yes, no?

Paul: Does the general public even know what the PAWG is? Thinks there needs to be some advertising, communication, something: BLM needs to explain to the public.

Shelley: In all public outreach, the purpose of PAWG is stated.

Paul: General public – were they ever contacted one on one?

Shane: That's unreasonable. If essence of PAWG flows from interest in the public, then that interest determines the flow of the PAWG. It depends on what the public chooses to keep up on. Unreasonable to call every person and explain what the PAWG does. Enough solicitations out there.

Paul: PAWG cannot put public notice in paper and explain what they do?

Shane: That's what we do.

Paul: not getting any response.

Eugene; hydro-geologic report. Part 1 of 4. What happens to the other 3 parts?

Shane: They will come out on schedule as they are prepared. Public presentations will be made. Gene can get a copy of it.

Gene: anticipating other 3 phases, if PAWG disbanded, then how will he get his input in?

Shane: public meetings.

John: If top section added – would it change. (BLM reopen nominations to allow the public one last chance to signal their desire to retain the PAWG. If nomination open-season does not produce sufficient interest to achieve a diverse pool of application to allow for a full PAWG, then: see above wording “let the PAWG charter.....”

Gene: Vlcek – a lot of activities prior to now. Public needed to understand.

Vlcek: Used to be momentum on the task groups.

Shane: Task groups, Dave, were a body of individuals with a collective interest in how they wanted things to happen with their common interest. They had an unreasonable expectation of what should be done, rather than be heard. Should be up front and understanding. He thinks what happened is that there was no reason that the group couldn't keep doing what they were doing. They had projects and a list of ideas they were working on. Disband is the word that changed things. The function they were performing was not what was stopped. They said that they shouldn't expect the BLM to do what they say every time.

Bart: This lead to a level of frustration because they didn't understand that the role was one of advice.

Gene: had heard that comment also.

Shane: His first meeting – never was reference made that they didn't want information brought forward. It was unreasonable to expect it be implemented.

Vlcek: Disagrees. Thinks that they didn't expect BLM FM to do what they said. He thinks that they expected that their effort be taken seriously.

John: Come back to Motion and adjustments.

Stephanie: this group passed something in a vote. We would have to rescind that. If folks don't want to change, then that vote stands.

Art: Would have to rescind and make a new motion.

John: Depends on governing procedures, which we don't have. Does anyone want to make that motion – to rescind?

Vlcek: tempted to.

Steph: change should come from someone from the majority (who voted with the majority).

John: doesn't require a whole lot of discussion.

Shane: is there a motion to rescind the first motion?

Shelley: Joy is gone and can't enter into discussion even though she voted on motion.

Mike: She chose to leave.

Shane: have vote. Next question – would you like any kind of a primer or conclusion saying whatever as to how the vote was arrived at?

Comment made – no, it is in the minutes of meeting.

Shane: will turn the motion into a memorandum after meeting.

John: thanks to everyone for discussion. Thorough discussion.

1:45 – 2:00      **Public Comment and Discussion of the Day's topics**

No public comment.

John will find out what is the next step.

Vlcek: recreation – didn't get Martin here, so other formats will be available . Recreation mitigation pursuant to the anticline has been woefully inadequate. He will pursue through other venues to provide substantial recommendation.

2:00 – 2:15          Discussion of Next Meetings

**Stephanie motions to adjourn.**

**Mike seconds**

**All in favor.**

**Meeting adjourned.**

2:15

**Adjourn**

Attached below is the memo and attendance roster.

Recommendation Memo

From: Pinedale Anticline Working Group

To: Designated Federal Official *Shane McAvoy 10/25/12 I concur*

SUBJECT: Discontinuation of PAWG Function

On October 25, 2012, the PAWG, met during a regularly scheduled public meeting. With full participation by all ten appointed members, and through voice vote of 7 in favor and 3 opposed, makes the following recommendations regarding the future of the PAWG.

1. Let the PAWG charter expire in August 2014 and discontinue meetings after this October meeting.
2. Simultaneously, the PAWG request a subcommittee be formed by the RAC to be available for local consultation (ensure continued local connection).
3. Requests that the Field Office Manager continue to be receptive and provide opportunities for meaningful public input and workshops as needed on matters of local concern.
4. Requests to be notified of the decision of the BLM in regards to the above recommendations as soon as practicable.

Signed



John Anderson, Chair, Pinedale Anticline Working Group



**PURPOSE:** *FF-113*

TIME: FROM 09.00 TO

DATE: 7/25/12

[illegible]